

1964

ers home administration committee; member, State advisory 4-H committee; field supervisor, Atlantic County Agricultural Conservation Association; member, Roadside Marketing Committee of the New Jersey Farm Bureau; and member, Atlantic County Board of Vocational Education. In his home community, he has served as township treasurer and member of the board of education.

I can think of no better testimonial than that which was given in the testimonial brochure, awarded to Mr. Sanguinetti in Mercerville on May 13, 1964, and I quote it in full:

LOUIS J. SANGUINETTI

Yours has been a lifetime of service to others. As a member of one of the pioneer families in Atlantic County, you have contributed much to the agricultural development and vigorous growth of the southern New Jersey area.

Ever modest and unselfish, you have served for a half century as an outstanding and respected leader. Successful in your own farm enterprise, you have always given generously of your time and talents in advancing the interests of others.

A true son of New Jersey soil, you have demonstrated a rare capacity for leadership in building stronger farm organizations. Because of your sincerity of purpose and genuine interest in the betterment of your fellow farmers, you have been honored with many offices, both local and statewide. In every instance, you have rendered loyal and devoted service.

Your efforts to build a stronger vegetable industry, particularly your role in the testing and marketing of new varieties of sweet potatoes, have won wide recognition. Growers continue to look to you for counsel and guidance.

In keeping with a longstanding tradition, your associates on the board of trustees desire to pay tribute to your long and noteworthy career and so award to you the medallion of the society as an expression of sincere gratitude on the part of countless New Jersey farmers.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me add my own good wishes to this dear friend of many years standing.

We have attended many agriculture affairs together. I have many times sought his advice in matters pertaining to farming and products of our south Jersey soil, and have always found him to be dependable, capable, and cooperative, and one who is certainly deserving of this honor recently bestowed.

The "Castro of the Colorado" Mixes Politics and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Udall, the "Castro of the Colorado," has curbed the flow of the river's water to southern California, Arizona, and Nevada by closing the floodgates of the newly completed Glen Canyon Dam in Utah.

The purpose, he says, is to fill Lake Powell, behind the dam, with water to be used for generation of power at the

damsite. To say that this action is somewhat premature may be an understatement when we consider that there are as yet no generators at Glen Canyon Dam.

The serious consequences of the Secretary's action with respect to the water needs of the Lower Colorado River Basin States are outlined in a Los Angeles Times editorial of May 13, titled "Water: Promises Aren't Enough." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial at this point.

WATER: PROMISES AREN'T ENOUGH

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall this week mixed politics and water—and southern California came out on the short end.

Breaking a pledge he had affirmed in 1962, the Secretary ordered the water storage at Hoover Dam reduced in order to build up the Colorado River water behind Glen Canyon Dam. As a result, southern California's primary water reserves and power generation potential at Hoover Dam will be dangerously cut back.

This manmade shortage is so serious that the Metropolitan Water District warned that another dry year could mean that there won't be enough Colorado River water for the MWD's 9 million customers.

There are as yet no generators at Glen Canyon Dam, but apparently a full head of political pressure had been built up. Secretary Udall not only bowed to the demands of the Upper Basin States but also had the temerity to propose that southern California, Arizona and Nevada voluntarily use 10 percent less water.

The Secretary nevertheless has probably done the States dependent upon the Lower Colorado a good turn in spite of himself.

First, his decision painfully illustrates that the shortage of Colorado River water may be much closer than the experts' estimate. Even the most pessimistic had assumed that the pinch would not be felt before 1970 or until the Central Arizona Project was in operation.

Obviously there is no time for delay in finding a sound regional solution to the shortage. And just as obviously the safeguards to California's basic water rights in such a solution must be clearly defined.

If Secretary Udall can break faith with California and Arizona on taking water from Hoover Dam, how can we accept the glittering promises in his Pacific Southwest water plan? There can be no doubt now that California's right to 4.4 million acre-feet from the Colorado River must be guaranteed by law.

This is set forth in the far better regional water plan introduced by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California. KUCHEL's bill provides for both this State's rightful share of the Colorado and for the Central Arizona Project, with the search for additional water broadened beyond the boundaries of the region.

Arizona, which suffered the Hoover Dam cutback with California, must now agree that the Kuchel water plan has never looked better.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in my report to my constituents which appears at

page A2578 of the RECORD of May 18, I inadvertently omitted a letter from Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Under permission granted, I submit herewith the matter referred to:

The Civil Rights Act of 1963, which I supported, and as a result of which I received the following letter from Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

APRIL 7, 1964.

HON. EDNA F. KELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: On March 30 the Senate began formal consideration of H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill passed by the House February 10, 1964, by a vote of 290 to 130.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People thanks you for your aid and for your vote in passing the most comprehensive civil rights bill in our history in a forthright effort to meet the greatest human rights crisis to face our Nation since the Civil War. We are advising our members in your district of your valued support for human rights.

We have also advised them and the general public that Congressmen of both parties who voted for the civil rights bill consistently in the Committee of the Whole where amendments were considered, as well as on final passage, deserve the support of voters at the polls next November.

We are working hard to persuade the Senate to follow your example and to enact H.R. 7152 substantially as it came from the House.

Very sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary.

A Peculiar Way To Run a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's request for \$125 million more for military and economic aid in South Vietnam should give Members of Congress food for thought.

Asking for more money seems to me just another gesture to attempt to fool the American people that we are really doing something to improve matters.

May I remind you we have already poured a half billion dollars into this war and certainly have very little to show for it. Well, I guess we do have something to show—a growing list of casualties.

Just what kind of a war are we running? Just what is our policy? It occurs to me that the approval of an additional \$125 million is not going to do any good until we come up with a clear program of action.

Furthermore, what about the billions of dollars which are already allocated for defense? Was no thought given to what might happen in southeast Asia?

As an editorial in today's Wall Street Journal points out, this is a peculiar way to run a war. I recommend it be read.

A PECULIAR WAY TO RUN A WAR

In asking Congress for an extra \$125 million for Vietnam, President Johnson says

A2664

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20

the money can't be squeezed out of programs already budgeted. If so, it makes one more sad commentary on the state of the Nation's military and financial affairs.

Now, \$125 million is no small sum by any standard. Compared with the totals for the relevant programs, however, it does not bulk so large; of the additional money, the Administration wants \$70 million for economic aid and \$55 million for military aid.

Disregarding carryovers, Congress appropriated \$3.4 billion for foreign economic and military aid for the present fiscal year, and many expect it to approve about the same for the new year beginning July 1. It is all but inconceivable that \$125 million can't be found in more than \$6 billion, especially since these assistance programs are notorious for their waste and dubious ventures.

Or suppose we ignore for the moment the distinction between so-called economic and military aid—after all, there is a war on. What about the defense budget itself? It runs over \$50 billion a year. Again, it is hard to believe that such a fantastic sum leaves no leeway at all for intensified prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

This proposition is all the more remarkable in that military spending has been considerably increased in recent years. In large part, it was said, the purpose was to develop more and better conventional (nonatomic) forces, the kind deployed in Vietnam. In other words, it would seem the Pentagon should already have been in position to fight a "little" war without still more money. As it happens, what the Nation hears about are pilots flying ancient aircraft and soldiers using makeshift equipment.

By the administration's own account, moreover, it apparently was not anticipated when the budget was submitted in January that there might be a need to step up the war; at any rate, the statement to Congress says no provision was made for any major new requirements that might emerge. Since the war was going badly in January and long before, it sounds like a curious form of military planning.

We realize that Vietnam is a notably difficult and disagreeable operation at best. But if this request represents the kind of military and financial thinking that has been going on, it is perhaps not surprising the United States is making no headway against the Vietnamese Communists.

Coming of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, few people stop to realize the important role that animal health products play in the feeding of a nation, either as end products, byproducts or intermediates.

Because of the direct bearing which this industry has on each of us, I wish to make available to fellow Members the remarks of Mr. George L. Varnes, the outgoing president of the Animal Health Institute, made before the 24th annual meeting of the institute here in Washington in April of this year.

COMING OF AGE

(By George L. Varnes)

It is a pleasure to welcome members and guests to the 24th annual meeting of the Animal Health Institute.

I am sure that each of you derives as much pleasure as I do in looking back at the growth and development of this association. Advances in products and procedures during the past 24 years have revolutionized the industry, and the members of the Animal Health Institute have certainly been part of that revolution. All of you can be proud of the contributions that you have made in the field of animal health.

If there was a need for the Animal Health Institute in 1941, that need has certainly been increased manifold in recent years. While our principles and purposes have remained the same, our membership has increased and become more active. But our growth has not been restricted to size alone. The institute has matured. In short, we have good reason to believe that the Animal Health Institute has come of age.

The institute has become the spokesman for the industry and is gaining recognition from legislators, regulatory agencies, the press, and allied industries. Such recognition is not awarded indiscriminately. We have had to earn it.

In our association we now have a depth of experience to contribute toward the solving of animal health problems. It is up to us to speak out strongly for worthwhile proposals and against those that are not in the public interest.

Let us hope, however, that our voice will not always be raised against proposals. I think that it is rather obvious that if we work for something we know is wise we will have less in the long run to fight against. Let us concentrate, then, on volunteering our years of experience in the form of knowledgeable proposals of our own.

Although coming of age means recognition, it also means responsibilities. All of us here are aware of the thousands of organizations that exist today. They range the alphabet from the Aaron Burr Association to the Society of Systemic Zoology. Many are doing a fine job but, unfortunately, many are organizations in name only.

The status of any organization must be earned. If the Animal Health Institute is to continue to be effective, it must be built on a foundation of hard work, cooperation, and acceptance of responsibilities.

Due to the very nature of our business, our responsibilities are many and important. They include the public, ourselves, the Institute, and the State and Federal regulatory agencies.

Let us not forget that all of our products serve the public in one way or another—either as end products, byproducts, or intermediates. It is up to us, as an industry, to help supply the public with high-quality meat, milk, and eggs at lower cost. We must continue our search for new and improved products that will make this possible. We must maintain—and, wherever possible, improve—our rigid quality control checks. These checks assure safe and effective products.

As individual manufacturers we have a responsibility to ourselves and to each other. Our integrity and reputation must remain unquestioned. In today's world the thoughtless actions of one firm can cause industrywide repercussions. Let us carry out our business ventures in a manner that will be a credit to ourselves and to the industry.

As members of the Animal Health Institute, we must be willing to work. We must accept committee assignments and positions of leadership, and we must work at them. Without effective participation, the Animal Health Institute, its programs, and its goals, will remain little more than unfulfilled ideas.

If we voluntarily meet the obligations I have outlined we will have done much to meet our responsibility to State and Federal regulatory agencies. There is more to be done, however.

As leaders in the animal health industry, we are in the best position to know what should be done, what can be done, and what will result if nothing is done. Therefore, it is our responsibility to communicate this knowledge to those whose decisions can and do affect our industry.

I would like to quote from a speech made at the American Feed Manufacturers Association's public affairs workshop last October. Former New Jersey State Senator James F. Murray, Jr., pointed out that we cannot have all the benefits of government and none of the responsibilities. He went on to say that, in his legislative experience, the average businessman is generally complacent about government and legislation—at least, until governmental action is going to immediately and adversely affect his industry, his business, his branch, and his office. Then, as Senator Murray put it: "He is prodded out of his ivory tower of indifference. He will descend upon you wherever you may be in office with all the fire in his eyes of a vestal virgin on the steps of the Roman temple the morning after."

Senator Murray's point is clear. We cannot wait until governmental action has been taken before we make our voice heard, for then it may be too late.

Commenting further, Senator Murray said: "It is better, in terms of the preservation of free enterprise, to stand up with a courageous informed opinion and be defeated than it is to have a most-informed opinion but to be unheard from."

I am sure that Senator Murray would be refreshed by the attitude of the Animal Health Institute toward government and legislation.

The Institute recognized that there was, and is, a need for specific legislation in the animal health field. The application of laws originally enacted for the protection of the human consumer of drugs has created problems for both the regulatory agencies and the animal health industry.

In an effort to provide a regulatory framework for animal health products, the Animal Health Institute has encouraged the passage of H.R. 7247. In our view this measure will insure animal health products of the highest quality and will continue to provide the regulatory agencies with the necessary authority to protect the public.

Gentlemen, the Animal Health Institute came of age with H.R. 7247.

Our sponsorship and support of this bill is a concrete example of this industry's effort to help establish workable laws and rules.

H.R. 7247 provides an opportunity for cooperation between industry and government to bring animal health legislation into line with today's requirements. By separating consideration of new animal drugs and new human drugs, the bill will speed scientific advancement and benefit the public, our customers, and the industry.

There are some who feel that our actions in trying to get this bill passed have resulted in an improved regulatory climate and that there is now no need for the bill. Perhaps this is an indication of our need for better communication with allied industries and associations. It is important for all to understand that we are not looking for temporary resolutions to long-term problems. H.R. 7247 is designed as a long-term solution to a long-time problem.

I have said before that the AHI is the spokesman for the industry. If we are to be an effective spokesman we must broaden our lines of communications. We are endeavoring to do this. The Institute's public relations committee is organizing a press contact program that is designed to acquaint newspaper and magazine editors with the Animal Health Institute and its programs. Through the press contact program we hope to reach agricultural audiences, the city-dwelling